BUDGET for the ENERGY ADVISORY FUNCTIONS and RESPONSIBILITIES

Budget items

- 1. Total general funds is currently 87,900
- 2. Current personnel budget is \$250,000
- 3. Studies requested under HB 46 costs is estimated to be between 90,000-165,000
- 4. State buildings Energy efficiency Program \$300,000
- 5. GOPB Economist 25,000 and GOPB Financial, payroll, and travel support: \$15,000 for a total of \$40,000.
- 6. Homeland security for Energy Emergency planner: \$80,000
- 7. Membership dues
 - a. Western Interstate Energy Board (Energy Arm of the Western Governor's Association and we are members): \$18,000
 - b. National Association of Energy Offices: \$2,050
 - c. Other technical contracts: \$2,000 year (supports economic function in OPB)

Recommendations on Funding

- 1. Change funding mix to allow full flexibility on Advisor's work product and task list:: \$140,000 general fund annually
- 2. Funding studies: \$25, 000 in general funds annually to fund progress on the following studies:
 - a. Nuclear
 - b. Refinery
 - c. Coal
- 3. Economic support through OPB at \$25,000. This does not need to be fully funded through general funds, but to the extent it is paid for through PVE dollars only specific studies commensurate with the federal guidelines of use of those funds can be pursued. Recommended funding level is \$20,000 general fund to allow for the greatest flexibility in performing studies of traditional resource development and energy needs in the state.
- 4. Total increase in general funds of \$98,100 for a total funding of \$186,000
- 5. Transfer funding responsibilities to other agencies
 - a. Homeland Security: Energy Emergency planner. This is currently being funded by PVE dollars but the issue is broader than the use of those funds allow. To provide permanence and flexibility of this position and tasks and to fulfill the objectives related to an Energy Emergency function as codified in HB46, it is recommended that this position be funded through general funds allocated to the Division of Homeland Security.
 - b. DFCM: The SBEEP program is very important to the state and we are currently funding the positions for this program. However, we only have a small pot of finite funds. It is our recommendation that some support for staffing for SBEEP be provided through general funds and that this will also support delivery of the DFCM responsibilities under HB80. The recommended level of general funds allocated directly to DFCM is 150,000. The remainder will continue to be funded through PVE dollars.)
 - i. Could be done with portion of 1.1% in building valuation funds that is allocated to capital improvement projects